

REMARKS

Status

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated February 11, 2004, in which Claims 1-15 were rejected and Claim 16 was withdrawn. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, and 15-16 have been canceled; Claims 2, 8, and 13 have been amended; and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, Claims 2, 8-9, and 13-14 are pending in the application, and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Election/Restriction

Applicants acknowledge the election of the Group I claims drawn to the invention of Claims 1-15. Applicants have canceled Claim 16.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 102

Claims 8, 10, and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,285,798 (*Lee*). While Claim 10 has been canceled, this rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to Claims 8 and 14.

Lee does not teach the claimed feature of creating a mapping function wherein the output value T is large when the gradient amplitude is moderate and the output value T is small when the gradient amplitude is very small and very large. This feature is claimed in independent Claim 8 and supported in the Specification starting at Page 19, line 27, wherein it is stated that the output value T is small when the edge gradient amplitude is very small or very large; and the output value T is big when the edge gradient is moderate.

In contrast, *Lee*'s output value V is zero when the edge gradient amplitude is large (see *Lee* at Col. 11, lines 3-4), and *Lee*'s output value V is 1.0 when the edge gradient amplitude is small (see *Lee* at Col. 11, lines 2-3).

As such, the mapping function of the present invention is not anticipated by *Lee*, and independent Claim 8 is believed to be patentable.

Claim 14 is dependent on Claim 8, and therefore includes all the features there of. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 8, Claims 14 is also believed to be patentable.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103 – *Lee/Vuylsteke*

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of US Patent No. 5,467,404 (*Vuylsteke*). While Claim 3 has been canceled, this rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to Claim 2.

Even if, for argument purposes only, *Vuylsteke* did disclose a “mountain-view” presentation in accordance with the present invention, the present invention would not be obvious from the cited references since neither reference teaches outputting both a contrast enhancement presentation image and a mountain-view presentation image so as to improve disease diagnosis. Absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination, obviousness cannot be established. Since such a showing is absent, it appears that the Examiner has used Applicant’s teaching to hunt through the prior art for the claimed elements and combine them as claimed by Applicant. Since neither reference suggests such a combination, obviousness cannot be supported.

In addition, the same decomposition filter is used to generate both output images. That is, as shown in Figure 1 of the present invention, decomposition filter 14 is employed in the creation of both the contrast enhancement presentation image and the mountain-view presentation image. Neither reference teaches this feature, and accordingly, obviousness cannot be established.

For the reasons stated above, Claim 2 is believed to be patentable.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103 - *Lee*

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Lee*. While Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, and 15 have been canceled, this rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to Claim 13.

Claim 13 has been amended to be dependent on independent Claim 8, and therefore includes all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 8, Claim 13 is believed to be patentable.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103 – *Lee/LaRossa*

Claims 6, 7, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of US Patent No. 6,611,627 (*LaRossa*). While Claims 6, 7, and 12 have been canceled, this rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to Claim 9.

Claim 9 is dependent on independent Claim 8, and therefore includes all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 8, Claim 9 is believed to be patentable.


Summary

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan L. Parulski
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,324

Susan L. Parulski/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 477-4027
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646